

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/714,266	11/14/2003	Vincenzo Casasanta III	14414-015001	3855
26191	7590 02/01/2005		EXAM	INER
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.			KOSLOW, CAROL M	
••••	RAUSCHER PLAZA SIXTH STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	LIS, MN 55402	•	1755	
			DATE MAIL ED. 02/01/200	•

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/714,266	CASASANTA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	C. Melissa Koslow	1755			
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RITHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 Cf after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory provided to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re in. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT statute, cause the application to become ABA	ply be timely filed  (30) days will be considered timely.  THS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status		•			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) ⊠	This action is non-final.	•			
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4)  Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the applicated 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and subject to restriction.	ndrawn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Example 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 14 November 2004  Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the ∞ 11)□ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)☐ the drawing(s) be held in abeyand prrection is required if the drawing(s	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docur 2. Certified copies of the priority docur 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ments have been received. ments have been received in Ap priority documents have been u ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SI Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/29/04.</li> </ol>	Paper No(s)	ummary (PTO-413) /Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152) 			

Application/Control Number: 10/714,266

Art Unit: 1755

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The serial numbers for the applications discussed in the first paragraph on page 1 need to be provided. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

This claim is indefinite since it is unclear which polymer of the two taught crosslinkable polymers is crosslinked. If both polymers are crosslinked, a polymer blend is not produced. The resulting composition would be co-polymer.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Application/Control Number: 10/714,266

Art Unit: 1755

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-24 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of copending Application No. 10/714,837. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Application No. 10/714,837 claims a composition comprising the polymers of claims 5-22 of this application, where at least one of the polymers is crosslinked. One of ordinary skill in the art would known that such a composition is produced by crosslinking and that at least one of the polymers is crosslinkable. The method of crosslinking depends on the crosslinkable groups and one of ordinary skill in the art knows that crosslinking is effected thermally, chemically or photochemically. The crosslinked composition in Application No. 10/714,837 suggests the process claimed in this application.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,814,887.

This reference teaches producing a polymer blend by combining a photo-crosslinkable high molecular polymer with a light emitting compound and photochemically crosslinking the Art Unit: 1755

polymer. The light emitting compound can be luminescent polyalkylfluorene polymers or luminescent polyphenylenevinylene polymers. (claims 5-9 and 14). The reference suggests the claimed process.

Claims 1-5, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,344,286.

This reference teaches a crosslinkable luminescent polymer, which can be a polyfluorene or a polybiphenyl polymer. Column 17, lines 34-36 teaches the polymer can be thermally or photochemically crosslinked. Column 18, lines 25-38 teach the polymer can be blended with a thermoplastic resin, which includes epoxies and silicones, which are known to be crosslinkable. The reference teaches the blend can be used to form a layer in an electroluminescent device and that the luminescent polymer is crosslinked thermally or photochemically after the layer is formed. Therefore the reference suggests the claimed process.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melissa Koslow whose telephone number is (571) 272-1371. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Bell, can be reached at (571) 272-1362.

The fax number for all official communications is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

cmk January 28, 2005 C. Melissa Koslow Primary Examiner Tech. Center 1700